

## REMARKS

Applicants reviewed the pending Office Action carefully before preparing this response. Reconsideration is respectfully requested. Nonetheless, in light of the positions presented herein, this application is believed to be in condition for allowance.

Several claims were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Watanabe. Applicants appreciate the Examiner's concern, but respectfully disagree. A reference cannot be anticipatory if it does not disclose all elements of a claim. Here, Watanabe fails to disclose several elements of independent claims 1 and 22.

Without limitation, Watanabe does not describe a substantially non-porous, amorphous aluminophosphate film on a substrate, and likewise fails to disclose a component between the film and substrate, as described by Applicants. Quite to the contrary, the Watanabe material is advantageously described as porous. (See, col. 2 at lines 1-12.) Further lacking as anticipatory, Watanabe does not describe an amorphous film on a substrate or a distinguishable component therebetween. The Examiner cannot infer or read into such elements so clearly missing from this reference. The Watanabe material is made from different starting materials and under different reaction conditions (i.e., evolution of gas to provide a porous coating). There is no basis on which to conclude or infer that Watanabe describes the missing elements.


Watanabe clearly fails as prior art in that it does not anticipate claimed subject matter clearly supported by the present specification. Without limitation, Applicants' substantially non-porous and amorphous film is adequately described as would be understood by one skilled in the art. With regard to the former, non-limiting reference is made to page 13. With regard to the latter, non-limiting reference is made to examples 4, 9 and 14-15, with further reference to Fig. 17. Non-limiting support for a component between such a film and a substrate is found on page 21, with reference to example 24. A relationship between Applicants' non-porosity and low surface energy is, for instance, explained on page 25 of the present specification. Such low surface energy would not be possible with the porous material of Watanabe.

Accordingly, Watanabe does not anticipate the present invention and cannot be used to infer elements clearly supported by the present specification. The rejection should be withdrawn, with the subject claims allowed to proceed toward issue.

Several claims were also rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as unpatentable over Watanabe. For the reasons discussed above, Watanabe is deficient and does not provide the claimed invention. There is no *prima facie* obviousness. Accordingly, the rejection should be withdrawn, with the subject claims allowed to proceed toward issue.

This application is believed to be in condition for allowance. Consistent therewith, favorable action is respectfully requested. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone should any issue remain. Thank you for your time and consideration.

Respectfully submitted:

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Rodney D. DeKruif  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No. 35,853

Reinhart Boerner Van Deuren s.c.  
1000 North Water Street, Suite 2100  
Milwaukee, WI 53202  
(414) 298-8360  
Customer No. 22922